

Harris, Bradley

From: Casler, Brian
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2008 8:09 AM
To: Harris, Bradley
Cc: Low, Christopher; Stephens, Deborah
Subject: RE: 10286368 **THIRD REQUEST**

The drawings are fine.

From: Harris, Bradley
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2008 9:51 AM
To: Casler, Brian
Cc: Low, Christopher; Stephens, Deborah
Subject: RE: 10286368 **THIRD REQUEST**
Importance: High

Good Morning,

Nearly another month has passed and this still has not been resolved.

The original NOA mailed 11-19-07 indicated new drawings were required. But it did not provide any specifics as to what was being objected to.

On 02-19-08 (the due date for any response) the applicant submitted a LET. stating that they had been faxed a copy of a supplemental NOA on that date and this supplemental NOA indicated no drawings were required therefore they were not submitting any new drawings. (see the NOA dated 02-27-08, I guess someone faxed a copy of this to the applicant before it got submitted for scanning).

However, the quality of the drawings dated 02-13-03 is questionable. Are these drawings acceptable? Or were new drawings required?

Bradley J. Harris
Management & Program Analyst
Office of Data Management -
(Formerly the Office of Patent Publication)

Phone 703-308-9250 ext 141
Fax 571-270-9838

From: Harris, Bradley
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2008 2:56 PM
To: Casler, Brian
Subject: 10286368 **SECOND REQUEST**
Importance: High

Good Afternoon,

Over one month has passed and this has not yet been resolved.
Can you please review this and take clarify this as soon as possible?

9/23/2008

Bradley J. Harris
Management & Program Analyst
Office of Data Management -

(Formerly the Office of Patent Publication)

Phone 703-308-9250 ext 141
Fax 571-270-9838

From: Harris, Bradley
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2008 8:47 AM
To: Casler, Brian
Subject: RE: 10875875 **THIRD REQUEST**

Thanks Brian. I have another application that has the same type of problem. The serial number is 10286368.

In this application the original NOA mailed 11-19-07 indicated new drawings were required. But it did not provide any specifics as to what was being objected to.

On 02-19-08 (the due date for any response) the applicant submitted a LET. stating that they had been faxed a copy of a supplemental NOA on that date and this supplemental NOA indicated no drawings were required therefore they were not submitting any new drawings. (see the NOA dated 02-27-08, I guess someone faxed a copy of this to the applicant before it got submitted for scanning).

However, the quality of the drawings dated 02-13-03 is questionable. Are these drawings acceptable? Or were new drawings required?

Thanks (I know this wasn't your application originally. You are just the unlucky guy who gets to clean up someone else's problems).

Bradley J. Harris
Management & Program Analyst
Office of Data Management -

(Formerly the Office of Patent Publication)

Phone 703-308-9250 ext 141
Fax 571-270-9838